



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,191	10/31/2001	Roland M. Hochmuth	10017760-1	5760
7590 06/23/2006			EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			nguyen, hau h	
Intellectual Property Adiminstration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/004,191	HOCHMUTH ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Hau H. Nguyen	2628	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
Period fo		<b>.</b>		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Op refol for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rood will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04	April 2006.		
•		his action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merits is	
	closed in accordance with the practice under	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 37-54 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withded claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 37-54 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		
Applicati	ion Papers			
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	ccepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	he drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Buresee the attached detailed Office action for a life	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National Stage	
Attachmen	• •	A) []	Summany (DTO 412)	
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Infor	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2628

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The response filed 04/04/2006 has been considered in preparing for this Office action.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 37-39, 43, 45, 50, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Ee (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,203).

Referring to claim 37, Van Ee teaches a display device as shown in Fig. 1 (col. 2, lines 51-54) communicatively couplable to a network (internet 116) and adapted to display the image, the display device comprising: a display network interface (114) operable to receive graphics image data of the image from the network (116); a display frame buffer (112) operable to store the received graphics image data (col. 2, lines 31-35); and a display refresh unit operable to read the graphics image data from the display frame buffer and display the image (col. 3, line 55 to col. 4, line 5).

Art Unit: 2628

As per claims 38 and 39, Van Ee teaches the display network interface comprising a network interface port for receiving graphics image from the network (wireless modem 14).

As per claim 43, Van Ee teaches the display device adapted to display the image via an LCD 102 (Fig. 1).

Claims 45 and 52, which are similar in scope to claims 37, are thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 50, which is similar in scope to claim 43, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 40-42, 44, 46-49, 51, 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Ee (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,203) in view of Robotham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,024).

Referring to claims 40-42, Van Ee fails to disclose a decompression unit to decompress graphics image data and store in the frame buffer. However, Robotham et al. teach a method to display of visual content on a client device using rasterized representations of visual content, wherein visual content is rendered on a server system, transformed into bitmaps compatible with the display attributes of a client

Art Unit: 2628

device, and transmitted for display on the client device (col. 3, lines 5-10). As shown in Fig. 1, the client 24, which can be a PDA, or a wireless phone, comprising a network interface graphical image from the network, a memory 7 to store the fetched graphical image data, a display 5 to retrieve and display the image data (col. 8, lines 30-52). Robotham et al. further teach the display device also includes a decompression unit to decompress graphics image data (col. 9, lines 40-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the decompression unit as taught by Robotham et al. in combination with the method as taught by Van Ee in order to reduce the bandwidth during data transmission.

As per claim 44, although Van Ee did not teach receiving the graphics image data from a remote source device via a plurality of packets, Robotham et al. teaches this feature as disclosed on col. 27, lines 48-60. Thus, claim 44 would have been obvious.

Claims 46-47, 49, 53-54, which are similar in scope to claims 40-42, are thus rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 48, Van Ee fails to teach storing decompressed graphics image data and the graphics image data in different portions of the display frame buffer. However, as cited above, Robotham et al. teach decompressing image data and storing decompressed image data. Robotham et al. further teach storing the received graphics image data into different portions of the display frame buffer (e.g. by dividing the received image into multiple tiles in which tile size is related to the size of a client viewport 16 so that the user to select or switch between tiles, pan across adjacent tiles,

Art Unit: 2628

and/or to scroll across adjacent tiles (col. 29, lines 24-40)). Thus, claim 48 would have

been obvious.

Claim 51, which is similar in scope to claim 44, is thus rejected under the same

rationale.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hau H. Nguyen whose telephone number is: 571-272-

7787. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI from 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on (571) 272-7794.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

H. Nguyen

6/21/2006

Kee M. Tung/

Page 5

mary Examiner